

REMARKS

In the present response, claims 3, 7, 13, 18, 23, 27, 29, 31, 33 and 34 are amended. Support for these amendments/additions is found throughout the originally submitted application. Therefore, claims 3-7, 9-11, 13-14, 18-20, 23, and 25-35 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

In the Office Action, claim 35 is rejected under 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action states that if it is determined in claim 34 that one query is issued then claim 35 is indefinite because it is claiming the possibility of more than one query issued.

The Applicants assert that claim 35 presents a proper dependent claim under 37 CFR 1.75 because it refers back to, and further limits, claim 34. That is, claim 34 includes the possibility of constructing and issuing one OR more queries, while claim 35 further limits that possibility to constructing and issuing at least a first and a second query, that is more than one query.

It is also noted that claim 34 can be interpreted as choosing one of two selections (local or remote information resource), however, claim 35 preserves the possibility of requiring both types of information resources. The Applicants believe the language of claim 34 is properly interpreted as choosing at least one of the two selections. There is no restrictive language that would prevent choosing more than one. Nevertheless, to avoid the possibility of misinterpretation, the Applicants present the above amendment to claim 34 so that it is clear that one or more queries can be issued to the local information resource, the remote information resource, or both the local and remote information resources.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action claims 27, 29, 31-35, 3-4, 6-7, 13-14, 18, 23, and 28 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (U.S. Patent No.

5,897,622) (hereinafter "Blinn") in view of Nazem (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,227) (hereinafter "Nazem") and in view of Bijnagte (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,680) (hereinafter "Bijnagte").

Applicants have amended claim 27, for example, to clearly recite a server for receiving an URL having a server name immediately followed by a separator immediately followed by an identifier interpreted as a product identifier identifying a product. It is clear that neither Blinn, Nazem, nor Bijnagte, alone or in combination, teach, suggest, or imply this element as used in this claim. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 27 is patentable over the cited references.

Furthermore, the remaining pending claims, either depend from, or include limitations similar to, claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over the cited articles for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 11/3/05



Nathan R. Maki
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981